DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 761 HE 010 092

AUTHOR Keith, Nathan R.
TITLE An Analysis of Student Perceptions of Self-Instructional Modules at GSU, 1974 and 1975. Research and Evaluation Report 9-76.
INSTITUTION Governors State Univ., Park Forest South, Ill.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 28p.
AVAILABLE FROM Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois 60466

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Autoinstructional Methods; *Course Evaluation; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Research Projects; School Surveys; Statistical Studies; *Student Opinion; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Self-instructional modules used as one of several learning delivery systems at the university were planned for extensive use as an integral part of the academic program. Students who have completed the modules were asked to complete a specially prepared evaluation form. The results of the responses obtained are summarized, and the statistical information presented. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154761

Research Reports

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Governors State University
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES AT GSU 1974 AND 1975

RESEARCH & EVALUATION
REPORT #9-76

HE 010092

Research & Innovation

Governors State University Park Forest South, Illinois 60466

2

Abstract

Report #9-76

An Analysis of Student Perceptions of
Self-Instructional Modules at GSU
1974 and 1975

Self-instructional modules (SIMs) used as one of several learning delivery systems at Governors State University (GSU) were planned for extensive use at the university. It was felt that this mode of instruction was particularly well suited to the needs of a significant proportion of the anticipated student body of the university. SIMs were to be an integral part of the academic program and the Instructional Communication Center (ICC) was assigned the responsibility to aid in the development of necessary materials. This study focuses on student perceptions of self-instructional modules at Governors State University.

Methodology

In 1973, an evaluation form was developed to obtain student evaluation of self-instructional modules. This instrument was designed to elicit student evaluations of several key factors related to self-instructional modules. This information is collected and analyzed to provide feedback to faculty coordinating self-instructional modules relative to how students feel about SIMs.

No administrative control system has been devised to require students to complete or faculty to collect evaluation forms upon completion of the SIM. Since students do not sign the evaluation forms, there is no way to verify that each student has completed the instrument. Only students who have successfully completed SIM modules have submitted evaluation forms.

Results

A total of 838 student evaluations of self-instructional modules were returned by Governors State University students in the period from January, 1974 through December, 1975. This represents evaluations from less than one-fourth of the students enrolled for SIMs in 1974 and 1975.

Table 1 gives the mean scores for each of the first 10 items of the survey instrument. Overall, students have given a positive evaluation to each of the 10 items, with some items having a more positive evaluation than others.

The responding students were most positive in their evaluation about items 1 (4.55), 8 (4.39), and 10 (4.35) measured on a scale of 1-5 (1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 4-agree, 5 strongly agree). These items deal primarily with course and material organization and clarity. Most of the students felt that instructional activities and evaluation were consistent with stated objectives (4.33) and that the coordinator of the module was readily available for personal consultation and assistance (4.30).

Students responding indicated agreement that the scheduling of SIMs allowed time to complete the self-instructional activities (4.20) and that they received adequate feedback on completed activities (4.16). The majority of students also

agreed that the technical quality of the instructional material was satisfactory (4.16).

Evidently students experience difficulty with necessary audio-visual equipment being available and in proper operating condition (3.72). Only slightly more than half the respondents felt that learning by this means allowed them more contact with fellow students than in a traditional classroom setting (3.45).

Table 1
Item Mean Scores for Student Evaluation of
Self-Instructional Modules
(Items 1-10)
Governors State University
1974 and 1975

Item	Number of Responses	Mean
1. The performance objectives for this module were clearly understood.	838	4.55
2. The students received adequate feedback on completed activities.	823	4.16
3. The technical quality of the instructional material was satisfactory.	828	4.18
4. Instructional activities and evaluation (Tests) were consistent with the objectives of the module.	812	4.33
5. The necessary audio-visual equipment (projectors, tapes, recorders, etc.) were readily available & in proper operating condition.	767	3.72
6. The Coordinator was readily available for personal consultation and assistance.	807	4.30
7. Learning by means of this system allows me more contact with my fellow students than in a traditional classroom setting.	799	3.45
8. The self-instructional materials adequately covered the subject matter of the learning module.	824	4.39
9. The schedule allowed sufficient time for me to complete the self-instructional activities.	835	4.28
10. The instructional material was presented in a clear and organized manner.	836	4.35

*Mean scores computed on item responses on a 5 point likert scale.

Table 2 gives student reactions to five more general statements about their experiences with self-instructional modules. Each of the scales for these items (questions 11-15) has a different choice of response but all are on a 5-point likert scale.

Nearly three-fourths (72%) felt that compared to other learning modules taken at GSU this instructional system has been more effective than most or one of the most effective.

Eighty-three percent (83%) of the respondents indicated in a positive manner that they would recommend the SIM they had taken to a friend.

Nearly half (47%) of the students evaluating SIMs indicated that the work load in this SIM module was heavier or much heavier than in other college level courses taken.

More than three-fourths (76%) of the respondents indicated that based on their experience with their SIM, they are looking forward to enrolling in more SIMs at GSU.

More than ninety percent (91%) of the respondents either responded favorably or very favorably to the concept of being able to learn the basic aspects of SIM modules at their own pace and convenience.

Very obviously those students who have successfully completed SIMs have positive feelings about SIMs. Further studies should focus on a determination of what type of student benefits most from SIMs.

Distribution of Student Evaluation by College

Tables 3 and 4 were developed in order to assess student evaluation of SIMs among colleges. Participation in the SIM evaluation varies considerably over colleges with very few evaluation forms received from students enrolled in the College of Cultural Studies' SIMs (16) and a relatively small number (55) have been received from students completing SIMs in the College of Environmental and Applied Sciences. Business and Public Service and Human Learning and Development both had a large number of SIM evaluation forms returned (251 and 526 respectively). Table 3 gives the mean score for each of the first 10 items on the SIM student evaluation form by college and for the total university. A brief overview indicates that, in general, students have a positive attitude toward SIMs (at least those students who have completed SIMs) with concerns focused primarily on mechanical problems with media related equipment and contact with their fellow students.

General Reaction to Self-Instructional Modules

Table 4 gives the summary of responses to the five general questions on the SIM evaluation form. The majority of individuals in each of the colleges responding to this part of the evaluation instrument felt quite positively about SIMs.

Table 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT GENERAL REACTION
TO SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES
(Items 11-15)
Governors State University
1974 and 1975

Item	Number of Responses	Response Choices				
		One of the Most Effec.	More Effec. than Most	About Average	Not as Effec. as Most	One of the Least Effec.
11. Compared to other learning modules that you have taken at GSU, how effective has this instructional system been?	776	303 (39%)	254 (33%)	168 (22%)	36 (5%)	15 (2%)
		Yes--Enthu-siastically	Yes	Undecided	No	No Emphatically
12. Would you recommend this module, as currently structured, to a friend?	833	312 (37%)	367 (44%)	85 (10%)	50 (6%)	19 (2%)
		Much Heavier	Heavier	About The Same	Lighter	Much Lighter
13. How would you compare the work load in this module to other college-level courses you have taken?	833	116 (14%)	278 (33%)	375 (45%)	57 (7%)	7 (1%)
		Yes--Enthu-siastically	Yes	Undecided	No	No Emphatically
14. Based upon your experience in this module, are you looking forward to enrolling in more self-instructional modules at GSU?	832	270 (32%)	370 (44%)	121 (15%)	56 (7%)	15 (2%)
		Very Favorably	Favorably	Undecided	Unfavorably	Very Unfavorably
15. How do you react to the concept of being able to learn the basic aspects of the module at your own pace and at your convenience?	836	469 (56%)	293 (35%)	47 (6%)	23 (3%)	4 (<1%)

TABLE 3

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES
1974 and 1975

Question	College				Total Univ.
	BPS	CS	EAS	HLD	
The performance objectives for this module were clearly understood.	4.76 (241)	4.25 (16)	4.46 (55)	4.47 (526)	4.55 (838)
The students received adequate feedback on completed activities.	4.50 (238)	4.31 (16)	3.46 (54)	4.07 (515)	4.16 (823)
The technical quality of the instructional material was satisfactory.	4.50 (239)	4.25 (16)	3.87 (53)	4.07 (520)	4.18 (828)
Instructional activities and evaluation (Tests were consistent with the objectives of the module.	4.59 (238)	4.33 (15)	4.07 (54)	4.24 (505)	4.33 (812)
The necessary audio-visual equipment (projectors, tapes, recorders, etc.) were readily available and in proper operating condition.	3.90 (184)	3.94 (16)	3.86 (51)	3.64 (516)	3.72 (767)
The Coordinator was readily available for personal consultation and assistance.	4.59 (234)	4.27 (15)	3.96 (53)	4.21 (505)	4.30 (807)
Learning by means of this system allows me more contact with my fellow students than in a traditional classroom setting.	3.04 (205	3.50 (16)	3.09 (55)	3.65 (523)	3.45 (799)
The self-instructional materials adequately covered the subject matter of the learning module.	4.65 (241)	4.27 (15)	3.96 (51)	4.32 (517)	4.39 (824)
The schedule allowed sufficient time for me to complete the self-instructional activities.	4.59 (241)	3.94 (16)	3.82 (55)	4.07 (523)	4.20 (835)
The instructional material was presented in a clear and organized manner.	4.63 (240)	4.31 (16)	4.08 (55)	4.25 (525)	4.35 (836)

Table 4

Mean Scores of Student Evaluation of Self-Instructional Modules by College General Questions 1974 and 1975

Question	College BPS	CS	EAS	HLD	Univ. Total
Compared to other learning modules that you have taken at GSU, how effective has this instructional system been?	4.34 (227)	4.61 (13)	3.50 (44)	3.93 (492	4.02 (776)
Would you recommend this module as currently structured, to a friend?	4.49 (242)	3.69 (16)	3.68 (55)	4.00 (520)	4.10 (833)
How would you compare the work load in this module to other college-level courses you have taken?	3.31 (241)	3.33 (15)	3.35 (54)	4.00 (523)	3.53 (833)
Based upon your experience in this module, are you looking forward to enrolling in more self-instructional modules at GSU?	4.39 (243)	3.62 (16)	3.74 (53)	3.84 (520)	3.99 (832)
How do you react to the concept of being able to learn the basic aspects of the module at your own pace and at your convenience?	4.64 (242)	3.93 (15)	4.07 (54)	4.39 (525)	4.44 (836)

Conclusion

Those students that have completed SIMs and returned evaluation forms have a positive attitude about this type of learning delivery system. On all questions on the evaluation form, mean scores for the university were above the midpoint of the measurement scale. There were differences among the colleges on many items but no collegial group of students gave evaluations consistently below the midpoint of the measurement scale.

This data represents only those students who have successfully completed a SIM and have chosen to return the evaluation form. No information is presently available on the perceptions of those students who have not been successful in completing SIMs. Further studies related to SIMs should attempt to identify noncompleters of SIM and assess the perceptions of these students relative to their experience with SIMs.

Since a relatively small percent of SIM enrolled students (estimated less than 25%) return SIM evaluation forms, the data obtained should be used very judiciously. Not all returns can be called representative of the students enrolled in the SIMs and any use of the SIM evaluation data should present the whole picture of returns and the representativeness of the data.

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES AT GSU 1974 and 1975

Research and Evaluation Report #9-76
Nathan R. Keith
Governors State University
Park Forest South, Illinois 60466

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Methodology 1

Limitation 2

Results 2

Distribution of Student Evaluation by College 7

Conclusion 13

TABLES

Table 1 - Item Mean Scores for Student Evaluation of Self-Instructional Modules (Items 1-10). 4

Table 2 - Frequency Distribution of Student General Reaction to Self-Instructional Modules (Items 11-13) 6

Table 3 - Student Evaluation of Self-Instruction Modules - 1974 and 1975 8

Table 4 - Mean Scores of Student Evaluation of Self-Instructional Modules by College - General Questions 12

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF
SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES AT GSU
1974 and 1975

Research and Evaluation
Report #9-76

Self-instructional modules (SIMs) used as one of several learning delivery systems at Governors State University (GSU) were planned for extensive use at the university. It was felt that this mode of instruction was particularly well suited to the needs of a significant proportion of the anticipated student body of the university. SIMs were to be an integral part of the academic program and the Instructional Communication Center (ICC) was assigned the responsibility to aid in the development of necessary materials.

Included in the planning guidelines for this nontraditional university is a requirement for a periodic evaluation of the many new and innovative aspects of the university. Since most evaluations carried on at the university are of a formative nature, this is an ongoing task looking at trends that have developed over the first several years of the institution's existence and making recommendations for change when necessary.

One particular evaluation task at this institution is the overall evaluation of the effectiveness of self-instructional modules. There are many dimensions to be considered in this evaluation including evaluation of material development, effectiveness of educational delivery, cost effectiveness, etc. This study, however, will focus on student perceptions of self-instructional modules at Governors State University.

Methodology

In 1975, an evaluation form was developed to obtain student evaluation

of self-instructional modules. This instrument was designed to elicit student evaluations of several key factors related to self-instructional modules . This information is collected and analyzed to provide feedback to faculty coordinating self-instructional modules relative to how students feel about them.

Faculty are requested to include a student evaluation form (Appendix) in each packet of module materials provided to students enrolling in the SIM. Upon completion of the SIM, students are requested to complete the evaluation form and return it to a centrally located collection point in the university. Students are not asked to sign evaluation forms. These evaluations are processed periodically and the results are presented to the professor coordinating the SIM.

Limitation

No administrative control system has been devised to require students to complete or faculty to collect evaluation forms upon completion of the SIM. Since students do not sign the evaluation forms, there is no way to verify that each student has completed the instrument.

Completion rates six months after registering in SIMs, as in other regular modules, range between 50 percent and 75 percent and, therefore, perception of the non-completers are never obtained. Only students who have successfully completed SIM modules have submitted evaluation forms.

Results

A total of 838 student evaluations of self-instructional modules were returned by Governors State University students in the period from January,

1974 through December, 1975. This represents evaluations from less than one-fourth of the students enrolled for SIMs in 1974 and 1975. It should be noted that these results only represent the responses of students who have completed one or more self-instructional modules. It is quite possible that these are the better students and would do well under most instructional strategies.

Table 1 gives the mean scores for each of the first 10 items of the survey instrument. Overall, students have given a positive evaluation to each of the 10 items, with some items having a more positive evaluation than others.

The responding students were most positive in their evaluation about items 1 (4.55), 8 (4.39), and 10 (4.35) measured on a scale of 1-5 (1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree). These items deal primarily with course and material organization and clarity. Most of the students felt that instructional activities and evaluation were consistent with stated objectives (4.33) and that the coordinator of the module was readily available for personal consultation and assistance (4.30).

Students responding indicated agreement that the scheduling of SIMs allowed time to complete the self-instructional activities (4.20) and that they received adequate feedback on completed activities (4.16). The majority of students also agreed that the technical quality of the instructional material was satisfactory (4.16).

Evidently students experience difficulty with necessary audio-visual equipment being available and in proper operating condition (3.72). Only slightly more than half the respondents felt that learning by this means allowed them more contact with fellow students than in a traditional classroom setting (3.45).

Table 1

ITEM MEAN SCORES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF
SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES
(Items 1-10)
Governors State University
1974 and 1975

Item	Number of Responses	Mean
1. The performance objectives for this module were clearly understood.	838	4.55
2. The students received adequate feedback on completed activities.	823	4.16
3. The technical quality of the instructional material was satisfactory.	828	4.18
4. Instructional activities and evaluation (Tests) were consistent with the objectives of the module.	812	4.33
5. The necessary audio-visual equipment (projectors, tapes, recorders, etc.) were readily available & in proper operating condition.	767	3.72
6. The Coordinator was readily available for personal consultation and assistance.	807	4.30
7. Learning by means of this system allows me more contact with my fellow students than in a traditional classroom setting.	799	3.45
8. The self-instructional materials adequately covered the subject matter of the learning module.	824	4.39
9. The schedule allowed sufficient time for me to complete the self-instructional activities.	835	4.28
10. The instructional material was presented in a clear and organized manner.	836	4.35

*Mean scores computed on item responses on a 5 point likert scale.

Table 2 gives student reactions to five more general statements about their experiences with self-instructional modules. Each of the scales for these items (questions 11-15) has a different choice of response but all are on a 5-point likert scale.

Nearly three-fourth (72%) felt that compared to other learning modules taken at GSU this instructional system has been more effective than most or one of the most effective. Only seven percent felt that SIMs are less than average in effective delivery of learning.

Eighty-three percent (83%) of the respondents indicated in a positive manner that they would recommend the SIM they had taken to a friend. Only 8 percent (69) indicated that they would not recommend the SIM, as it was structured, to a friend.

Nearly half (47%) of the students evaluating SIMs indicated that the work load in this SIM module was heavier or much heavier than in other college level courses taken. Forty-five percent (45%) indicated that the work load was about the same, while only 18 percent felt that the work load was lighter than in other courses.

More than three-fourths (76%) of the respondents indicated that based on their experience with their SIM, they are looking forward to enrolling in more SIMs at GSU. Nine percent indicated they were not looking forward to enrolling in more SIMs, while the remaining 15 percent were undecided.

More than ninety percent (91%) of the respondents either responded favorably or very favorably to the concept of being able to learn the basic aspects of SIM modules at their own pace and convenience. Less than 4 percent indicate objection to self-pacing and 6 percent were undecided.

Table 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT GENERAL REACTION
TO SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES
(Items 11-15)
Governors State University
1974 and 1975

Item	Number of Responses	Response Choices				
		One of the Most Effec.	More Effec. than Most	About Average	Not as Effec. as Most	One of the Least Effec.
11. Compared to other learning modules that you have taken at GSU, how effective has this instructional system been?	776	303 (39%)	254 (33%)	168 (22%)	36 (5%)	15 (2%)
		Yes--Enthu-siastically	Yes	Undecided	No	No Emphatically
12. Would you recommend this module, as currently structured, to a friend?	833	312 (37%)	367 (44%)	85 (10%)	50 (6%)	19 (2%)
		Much Heavier	Heavier	About The Same	Lighter	Much Lighter
13. How would you compare the work load in this module to other college-level courses you have taken?	833	116 (14%)	278 (33%)	375 (45%)	57 (7%)	7 (1%)
		Yes--Enthu-siastically	Yes	Undecided	No	No Emphatically
14. Based upon your experience in this module, are you looking forward to enrolling in more self-instructional modules at GSU?	832	270 (32%)	370 (44%)	121 (15%)	56 (7%)	15 (2%)
		Very Favorably	Favorably	Undecided	Unfavorably	Very Unfavorably
15. How do you react to the concept of being able to learn the basic aspects of the module at your own pace and at your convenience?	836	469 (56%)	293 (35%)	47 (6%)	23 (3%)	4 (<1%)

Very obviously those students who have successfully completed SIMs have positive feelings about SIMs. Further studies should focus on a determination of what type of student benefits most from SIMs.

Distribution of Student Evaluation by College

Tables 3 and 4 were developed in order to assess student evaluation of SIMs among colleges. Participation in the SIM evaluation varies considerably over colleges with very few evaluation forms received from students enrolled in the College of Cultural Studies SIMs (16) and a relatively small number (55) have been received from students completing SIMs in the College of Environmental and Applied Sciences. Business and Public Service and Human Learning and Development both had a large number of SIM evaluation forms returned (251 and 526 respectively). Table 3 gives the mean score for each of the first 10 items on the SIM student evaluation form by college and for the total university. A brief overview indicates that in general students have a positive attitude toward SIMs (at least those students who have completed SIMs) with concerns focused primarily on mechanical problems with media related equipment and contact with their fellow students.

Most students either agreed or strongly agreed that the performance objectives for their module were clearly understood as indicated by a mean score of 4.55 (5 points each) for the total university. Means of each of the four colleges was greater than 4.00 indicating a relatively high degree of agreement among the students of the four colleges.

Students generally agreed (4.16 total university) that they received adequate feedback on completed activities. However, Environmental and Applied

TABLE 3

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES
1974 and 1975

Question	College				Total
	BPS	CS	EAS	HLD	Univ.
The performance objectives for this module were clearly understood.	4.76 (241)	4.25 (16)	4.46 (55)	4.47 (526)	4.55 (838)
The students received adequate feedback on completed activities.	4.50 (238)	4.31 (16)	3.46 (54)	[illegible] (515)	4.16 (823)
The technical quality of the instructional material was satisfactory.	4.50 (239)	4.25 (16)	3.87 (53)	4.07 (520)	4.18 (828)
Instructional activities and evaluation (Tests were consistent with the objectives of the module.	4.59 (238)	4.33 (15)	4.07 (54)	4.24 (505)	4.33 (812)
The necessary audio-visual equipment (projectors, tapes, recorders, etc.) were readily available and in proper operating condition.	3.90 (184)	3.94 (16)	3.86 (51)	3.64 (516)	3.72 (767)
The Coordinator was readily available for personal consultation and assistance.	4.59 (234)	4.27 (15)	3.96 (53)	4.21 (505)	4.30 (807)
Learning by means of this system allows me more contact with my fellow students than in a traditional classroom setting.	3.04 (205	3.50 (16)	3.09 (55)	3.65 (523)	3.45 (799)
The self-instructional materials adequately covered the subject matter of the learning module.	4.65 (241)	4.27 (15)	3.96 (51)	4.32 (517)	4.39 (824)
The schedule allowed sufficient time for me to complete the self-instructional activities.	4.59 (241)	3.94 (16)	3.82 (55)	4.07 (523)	4.20 (835)
The instructional material was presented in a clear and organized manner.	4.63 (240)	4.31 (16)	4.08 (55)	4.25 (525)	4.35 (836)

Sciences students do not appear to feel that they received as much feedback (3.46) as students from other colleges (BPS, 4.50; CS, 4.31, HLD, 4.07). This figure (3.46) is more than one-half unit of measurement below that of any of the other colleges and these results should be reviewed in the context of the type of feedback planned for students in SIMs offered by the College of Environmental and Applied Sciences.

The technical quality of the instructional material was satisfactory to the majority of students in each of the colleges. Collegial mean scores on the above statement ranged from a high of 4.50 in BPS offered SIMs to a low of 3.87 in EAS offered SIMs. Although there is some deviation between perceptions from students in each of the colleges it should be noted that all the collegial means are above the midpoint of the scale.

It appears that instructional activities and evaluations were consistent with the objectives of the modules in each of the colleges. Responses from all four colleges yielded mean scores greater than 4.0 with collegial means ranging from 4.07 (EAS) to 4.59 (BPS).

When responding to the statement, "The necessary audio-visual equipment was readily available and in proper workin condition," students enrolled in SIMs were less satisfied than with other items on the survey. Collegial means ranged from 3.64 (HLD) to 3.94 (CS) which is a narrow range, indicating consistency across colleges in perceptions about availability of properly working equipment. Students evidently feel that there needs to be improvement in the availability and condition of the audio-visual equipment that they use in their SIMs.

Most students felt that the coordinator was readily available for personal consultation and assistance (total university = 4.30). However, there was some difference in perception across colleges that ought to be noted. It appears that BPS students felt most strongly that professors coordinating their SIMs were available (4.59) while EAS students indicated the greatest dissatisfaction (3.96) with the availability of professors for personal consultation and assistance with their SIMs.

The seventh question on the evaluation form dealt with student contact with their fellow students. As would be expected, more students disagreed than agreed with the statement that learning by means of this system allows me more contact with my fellow students than in a traditional setting. The majority of students disagreed with the above statement and the university mean score for this item was 3.45.

The majority of students completing SIMs agreed what the self-instructional materials adequately covered the subject matter of the learning module (university mean = 4.39). BPS students had the highest mean among the colleges (4.65) while EAS students (3.96) felt least strongly about materials adequately covering subject matter in the SIMs in which they were enrolled.

Most students felt that the schedule for their SIM allowed sufficient time for them to complete the self-instructional activities. However, most SIMs are self-paced and there is generally no pressure to complete the module in the 8 or 16 week session for which students have enrolled. Although there is self-pacing in the SIMs, students in BPS (4.59) and HLD (4.07) seem to feel that there is more allowable time to complete the module than students in CS (3.94) and EAS (3.82).

The majority of students felt that the instructional material was presented in a clear and organized manner (university mean = 4.35) in their SIMs. All collegial mean scores were 4.0 or greater on this item which shows a general consensus about the good quality of the materials that SIM coordinators have created for them.

Students completing SIMs were also asked to respond to five more general statements about SIMs. The following tables give the result of these statements. The five questions each had a different set of responses (all 5-point likert-type scales) and these have been corrected to mean scores in Table 4.

General Reaction to Self-Instructional Modules

Table 4 gives the summary of responses to the five general questions on the SIM evaluation form. The majority of individuals responding to this evaluation felt that SIMs are more effective than most learning modules when the two systems are compared. On a five point scale, the university mean for 776 responses to the first item on Table 4 was 4.02. BPS students gave the strongest ratings for SIMs when comparing them to regular learning modules (4.34) while EAS students gave SIMs the weakest evaluation (3.50) among the colleges.

Most students indicated that they would recommend this module as currently structured, to a friend (university mean = 4.10). Strongest recommendations came from BPS students (4.49) while EAS and CS gave lowest recommendations of 3.68 and 3.69 respectively. Although there is a significant range in means among colleges, most students still have a positive attitude toward recommending these modules (SIMs) to their friends.

TABLE 4

MEAN SCORES OF STUDENT EVALUATION OF
SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES BY COLLEGE
GENERAL QUESTIONS
1974 and 1975

Question	College				Univ.
	BPS	CS	EAS	HLD	Total
Compared to other learning modules that you have taken at GSU, how effective has this instructional system been?	4.34 (227)	4.61 (13)	3.50 (44)	3.93 (492)	4.02 (776)
Would you recommend this module as currently structured, to a friend?	4.49 (242)	3.69 (16)	3.68 (55)	4.00 (520)	4.10 (833)
How would you compare the work load in this module to other college-level courses you have taken?	3.31 (241)	3.33 (15)	3.35 (54)	4.00 (523)	3.53 (833)
Based upon your experience in this module, are you looking forward to enrolling in more self-instructional modules at GSU?	4.39 (243)	3.62 (16)	3.74 (53)	3.84 (520)	3.99 (832)
How do you react to the concept of being able to learn the basic aspects of the module at your own pace and at your convenience?	4.64 (242)	3.93 (15)	4.07 (54)	4.39 (525)	4.44 (836)

When work load in SIMs is compared to work load in other college level courses, students perceive a heavier required work load (university mean = 3.53). Students in HLD perceive a heavier work load (4.00) than any of the other three colleges (BPS 3.31, CS 3.33, EAS 3.35).

Most students returning evaluation forms felt that, based on their experience so far in SIMs, they were looking forward to enrolling in more SIMs at GSU (university mean = 3.99). Students in BPS showed the greatest enthusiasm

in further enrollment in SIMs (4.39), followed by HLD (3.84), EAS (3.74), and CS (3.62).

Students are very positive (university mean = 4.44) in reacting to being able to learn the basic aspects of the module at their own pace and convenience. The majority of students in each college completing SIM evaluation forms reacted either favorably or very favorably to the above statement. This is one aspect of SIMs that students appear to perceive very positively in each of the colleges.

There is some difference among colleges on the five questions (11-15) eliciting general reactions by students completing SIMs. Table 4 gives the distribution of mean scores by college for items 11 through 15. Each item on Table 4 is on a 5-point likert scale (1-low, 5-high) and each of these scales are given in Table 3.

Conclusion

Those students that have completed SIMs and returned evaluation forms have a positive attitude about this type of learning delivery system. On all questions on the evaluation form, mean scores for the university were above the midpoint of the measurement scale. There were differences among the colleges on many items but no collegial group of students gave evaluations consistently below the midpoint of the measurement scale.

This data represents only those students who have successfully completed a SIM and have chosen to return the evaluation form. No information is presently available on the perceptions of those students who have not been successful in completing SIMs. Further studies related to SIMs should attempt to identify noncompleters of SIMs and assess the perceptions of these students relative to their experience with SIMs.

Since a realtively small percent of SIM enrolled students (estimated less than 25%) return SIM evaluation forms, the data obtained should be used very judiciously. Not all returns can be called representative of the students enrolled in the SIMs and any use of the SIM evaluation data should present the whole picture of returns and the representativeness of the data.